

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Presently, Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the disclosure in U.S. Patent No. 5,179,650, hereinafter *Fukui*.

Fukui discloses a method and apparatus for editing documents where a document is scanned, the document characteristics are extracted from all the document data (column 5, lines 2-3), and based on the characteristics extracted, all of the document data is extracted, recorded and reproduced in the resulting product. Document data contains "elements such as article data, graphic data and image data..." (column 3, lines 17-22). Figure 17 shows three scanned pages having a document data portion that does not fill all the available space on three pages (column 8, line 34). The three pages are scanned and all the document image data is extracted and rearranged to fit onto two pages having less excess available space than before (column 8, lines 38-45).

On December 16, 2004 Examiner Brier graciously conducted an interview with the Applicant's representative, Kevin McGoff. At that interview, it was agreed that amending the claim language to include "the extracted at least one document block" containing "fewer characters or figures than does the entire image" would differentiate the claims over the disclosure in *Fukui*.

Therefore, the claim language is amended and now recites combinations including features directed toward extraction of at least one document block from among an entire image, the entire image including at least one character or figure,

wherein all the extracted document blocks together contain fewer characters or figures than does the entire image.

Fukui does not disclose a combination including these features and does not anticipate Claims 1, 9, 17 and 27.

Also, dependent Claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-26 and 28-36 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims.

Claims 28-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. On the bottom of page three of the Official Action it is proposed that an independent claim defining that the reconstructed document blocks are together less than the entire image, and a dependent claim defining that the reconstructed document block area is the same as the extracted document block area, is indefinite. This rejection is traversed, because it is accurate to define that 1) the reconstructed document blocks are together less than the entire image, and 2) that the reconstructed document block area is the same as the extracted document block area. In other words, the extracted document blocks are less than the entire image, and the reconstructed document block area is the same as the extracted document block area and therefore also less than the entire image. For at least this reason, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims 32 and 33 are newly added by this amendment.

New Claim 32 is generally directed to a combination of features including at least one circuit for extracting at least one document block, wherein the at least one document block contains a specific image to be processed, from among an entire image. The entire image includes at least one character or figure. All the extracted

document blocks together contain fewer characters or figures than does the entire image. As noted above, *Fukui* does not disclose this combination of features.

Claim 33 is generally directed toward at least one circuit for extracting at least one document block from an entire image, the at least one document block being identified by a perimeter and containing a specific image to be processed. The perimeter is established by the user beforehand. *Fukui* does not disclose this combination of features.

For at least the reasons stated above, it is requested that all the rejections be withdrawn and that this application be allowed in a timely manner.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner feel that a teleconference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: January 19, 2005

By: Kevin B. McGoff
Kevin B. McGoff
Registration No. 53,297

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620